

REMARKS

In response to the Non-Final Office Action dated February 8, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 8-19 and 21-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 are rejected. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 22-25 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 18 and 21 have been amended, Claims 5, 6, 7, 20, 25 and 26 have been previously canceled, leaving claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks. In particular, independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include the limitation further defining the light incident surface as being substantially smooth. Support for the amendment to independent claims 1 and 18 may be found at least on page 16, lines 1-2 and FIGS. 9-14 of the application as originally filed. Claim 18 has been amended to include some of the limitations in amended claim 21.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,462, hereinafter “Suzuki”). The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 1-4, 14 and 16-17 except, *the refractive index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 10 and 11 except, *the light emission angle is in a range from about 5.86° to about 26.23° and that the inclined surfaces are configured such that the light incident on one of the inclined surfaces travels in accordance with the claimed equations 1 to 3*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 18, 19 and 21 except, *the refractive index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason set forth below.

First, it is respectfully noted that independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a light incident surface for receiving the light, the light incident surface is substantially smooth . . .

In contrast, it is respectfully noted that Suzuki discloses that it is critical or required that a lower or first surface of the optical film 9 has an optically rugged structure which is similar to the surface of frosted glass. (Col. 4, lines 27-33 and FIG. 3) Suzuki discloses that if the first or bottom surface is optically smooth, diffuse transmission does not occur. Diffuse transmission at the first surface is required to prevent the printed dot pattern of the light guide 8 from being observed by an operator. (Col. 4, lines 34-38) Further, Suzuki discloses that if the optically rough structure is not formed on the first surfaces of the optical film 9, the printed dot pattern of the light guide 8 is observed by human eyes. This degrades the quality of a displayed image. (Col. 4, lines 341-45)

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Suzuki does not teach or suggest, and in fact teaches away from, a light incident surface for receiving the light, the light incident surface is substantially smooth, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 18. Thus, independent claims 1 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21, define over Suzuki.

Second, it is respectfully submitted that Suzuki discloses an edge-illumination type LCD apparatus having a lamp disposed at a side of a light guide as illustrated in FIG. 3. In contrast, the present invention includes a direct-illumination type LCD apparatus having lamps disposed ... opposite to a side at which the prism sheet is disposed, as recited in amended claim 18. Thus, Suzuki et al. do not teach or disclose the features of the present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 18.

Thus, independent claim 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 19 and 21, define over Suzuki, for at least this additional reason.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 8547
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: June 6, 2007